

Quantum authentication with unitary coding sets

Esther Pérez,¹ Marcos Curty,^{1,2} David J. Santos,^{1,*} and Priscila García-Fernández³

¹*ETSIT, Universidad de Vigo, Campus Universitario s/n, E-36200 Vigo, Spain*

²*Quantum Information Theory Group, ZEMO (Zentrum für Moderne Optik),
University Erlangen-Nürnberg, Staudtstr. 7/B2, D-91058 Erlangen, Germany*

³*Instituto de Óptica, CSIC, Serrano, 123, E-28006 Madrid, Spain*

A general class of authentication schemes for arbitrary quantum messages is proposed. The class is based on the use of sets of unitary quantum operations in both transmission and reception, and on appending a quantum tag to the quantum message used in transmission. The previous secret between partners required for any authentication is a classical key. We obtain the minimal requirements on the unitary operations that lead to a probability of failure of the scheme less than one. This failure may be caused by someone performing a unitary operation on the message in the channel between the communicating partners, or by a potential forger impersonating the transmitter.

I. INTRODUCTION

Providing a way to check the integrity of information transmitted over or stored in an unreliable medium is of prime concern to the fields of open computing and communications. Mechanisms that provide such integrity check are called message authentication schemes [11]. They were originally proposed by Gilbert and co-workers [8], while the general theory of unconditional authentication was developed by Simmons (see e.g. [12]).

In the analysis of any message authentication scheme one has to consider three participants: A transmitter (Alice), a receiver (Bob), and an opponent (Eve). Alice wishes to communicate some information (the plain-text) to Bob using a public communications channel; Bob, in turn, would like to be confident that any information received actually came from Alice, rather than from some third party (Eve). Much as in the usual encryption scenario, classical cryptography provides two different approaches to authentication: secret-key and public-key authentication. In this paper we will focus on the first scenario, the secret-key setting, and therefore we shall assume that Alice and Bob share some secret key previously established in a secure manner. This key allows Alice to select an encoding rule (a one-to-one function between the set of plain-texts and the set of messages, also called cipher-texts), chosen from a predetermined set, and encode the plain-text to obtain the message, which is then sent to Bob through the channel. The encoding rule, which is usually changed every time a new message is transmitted, defines a set of valid messages. Upon receiving a message, Bob accepts it as being authentic (i.e. as coming from Alice) if and only if it belongs to that set, in which case he will recover the plain-text applying the corresponding decoding rule. This decoding rule is well-defined since each encoding rule is one-to-one.

A special class of secret-key message authentication schemes are message authentication codes (MACs), which contain the plain-text in the clear. In this case, each encoding rule generates, depending on the value of the actual plain-text, an authenticator or tag that is appended to the plain-text before actually sending it. MACs decoding rules return, depending on the plain-text and the tag, a bit indicating when Bob must regard the message as authentic, and accepting it as coming from Alice, and when he must discard it. The basic requirement is that the tags, which are produced by the encoding rule, must be accepted as valid when the matching decoding rule is used on reception. When an authentication protocol fulfills this requisite it is said to provide perfect deterministic decoding. Wegman and Carter [14] introduced several information-theoretic secure constructions for such schemes. Basically, their techniques use universal hash families as the coding set. To generate the tag, Alice uses a particular hash function, selected from the universal hash family by the secret key. This action compresses the plain-text to a smaller string of bits. The string of bits can be later encrypted using the Vernam cipher [13]. This last step allows to re-use the encoding rules, since Eve cannot obtain any information about the particular hash function used by Alice and Bob.

The possibility of employing quantum resources to obtain more efficient classical-message quantum authentication schemes is still an open issue. In [5] the authors showed that, using quantum effects, the authentication of a binary

*E-mail address: dsantos@com.uvigo.es

classical message is possible with a key of length shorter than the one required by classical schemes. However, it is not clear yet whether more efficient quantum techniques exist for longer messages.

While the authentication of classical messages is a fundamental topic in classical communications networks, the analogous quantum problem, the authentication of quantum states, could also become important in future quantum information communication systems. Leung has addressed this question partially in [10]. Her proposal is based on a modification of the private quantum channel [1, 4]. The authentication process requires a classical secret key, a quantum communications channel, and an authenticated two-way classical one. Another classical secret-key quantum authentication protocol, but without additional classical communication, has been proposed in [2]. This scheme uses stabilizer purity testing codes, and its error probability decreases exponentially with the length of the quantum tag. Rather surprisingly, the authors also showed that any protocol that guarantees unconditionally secure authenticity must encrypt the quantum plain-text almost perfectly. This fact contrasts with classical MACs, where encryption of the plain-text is not necessary for unconditional security. More recently, Gea-Banacloche [7] has approached data authentication from an steganographic perspective, making use of standard quantum correcting code techniques.

In this paper we analyse a special class of authentication schemes for quantum messages. In particular, we study those which use classical secret keys and coding sets composed of unitary operations. Our main goal is to find the minimal conditions that must be satisfied by any unitary coding set so as to make quantum authentication possible. We analyse the security of the scheme under two general attacks. In the first one, the unitary attack, Eve, who knows both the coding and decoding sets, tries to modify the cipher-text by means of a unitary operation. In the second, the forgery attack, Alice has not initiated the transmission yet (or it may have been blocked by Eve), and Eve attempts to prepare a new fake quantum message with the purpose of passing Bob's verification test.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we describe general authentication schemes for quantum messages, and we introduce those which use unitary coding sets. We also present some notation used in the paper. Sec. III analyzes the unitary attack, and Sec. IV focuses on the forgery attack. In Sec. V we discuss the restrictions that these two attacks impose upon both coding sets. Finally, we present our conclusions in Sec. VI.

II. AUTHENTICATION OF QUANTUM MESSAGES

Suppose Alice needs to send a certified quantum message to Bob. Her goal is to make Bob confident about the authenticity of the message and sender. If we consider an scenario where both participants share a quantum secret key (for example, a set of EPR pairs), and they have access to an authenticated classical channel, then the solution is quite simple: Alice can just use quantum teleportation [3] to send the quantum plain-text. However, the reliable storage and manipulation of entangled quantum objects is not technologically available yet, so a more practical situation arises when the secret key shared by the two partners is classical.

Analogously to the classical setting, quantum authentication with a classical secret key can be performed in three phases:

1. *Tagging*: To certify her message (the plain-text), Alice appends to it a particular public-known quantum state that we shall call, following the standard classical notation, a tag. Specifically, we will assume that both message and tag quantum states belong, respectively, to the state spaces $\mathcal{M}$ ($\dim(\mathcal{M}) = M$), and $\mathcal{T}$ ($\dim(\mathcal{T}) = T$). The space of tagged messages is defined, therefore, as $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{T}$. Alice and Bob also openly agree in a particular splitting of the tag space $\mathcal{T}$ in the direct sum of two subspaces $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{V} \oplus \mathcal{V}^\perp$, where $\mathcal{V}$ is considered the subspace of valid tags and $\mathcal{V}^\perp$ the subspace of invalid tags. This splitting of $\mathcal{T}$ leads naturally to the direct sum $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{C} \oplus \mathcal{C}^\perp$, where $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{V}$ will be the subspace of valid messages (usually called the code space; $\dim(\mathcal{C}) = C$), and $\mathcal{C}^\perp = \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{V}^\perp$ will be the subspace of invalid messages ($\dim(\mathcal{C}^\perp) = D$). The original tagged message has the general form $\rho_{\mathcal{E}} = \rho_{\mathcal{M}} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{T}}$, with $\rho_{\mathcal{M}}$ the plain-text quantum message and $\rho_{\mathcal{T}}$ any state in $\mathcal{V}$.
2. *Encoding*: After the tagging procedure has been completed, Alice, depending on the value of the n -bit key, k , shared with Bob, performs an encoding rule on the tagged message. In principle, encoding (and decoding) rules could be trace-preserving completely positive maps (TPCP), but in this paper we will restrict ourselves to the case of unitary rules. Therefore, the encoding rule, $U(k)$, is selected from the unitary coding set $\{U(0), \dots, U(K-1)\}$, where $K = 2^n$ and, without loss of generality, we set $U(0) = I$. If the tagged message is $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$, then the state of the message Alice sends to Bob is given by

$$\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(k) = U(k)\rho_{\mathcal{E}}U^\dagger(k). \quad (1)$$

Thus, a tagged message encoded by Alice with $U(k)$ will necessarily belong to $\mathcal{C}_k$, the subspace of all the tagged messages transformed by $U(k)$.

3. *Verification*: To verify the authenticity of the received message, Bob needs to check whether it belongs to $\mathcal{C}_k$ or not. In the latter case, he should regard the message as invalid and so discard it. One way in which Bob can make this check is performing the matching decoding rule $U^\dagger(k)$ (from the decoding set $\{U^\dagger(0), \dots, U^\dagger(K-1)\}$) on the received encoded tagged message, and then measure the tag portion to see whether the resulting tagged message belongs to $\mathcal{C}$ or to $\mathcal{C}^\perp$. If it belongs to $\mathcal{C}$, and no forgery on the encoded tagged message has taken place in transit, he could unambiguously recover the original plain-text, just tracing out the tag system.

In the next two sections we shall analyse the minimal conditions that any unitary coding set must satisfy in order to make authentication possible. It should be clear from the outset that we are not looking for the optimal coding sets, defined as those which make the probability of failure of the protocol minimal. Therefore, our scheme will be secure if Eve can only break it in a probabilistic way. We shall study two general attacks. In the unitary attack we shall regard Eve capable of modifying the state in the channel by means of a unitary operation; in the case of forgery we shall assume that Eve can intercept the state travelling from Alice to Bob, discard it, and forge a new tagged message. In both cases we shall frequently use operators acting on the space $\mathcal{E}$, and we shall be interested in describing how these operators act on the $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ subspaces. If we define the orthogonal projection operators P_i and P_o as the ones that, respectively, project a state from $\mathcal{E}$ into $\mathcal{C}$ or $\mathcal{C}^\perp$, an arbitrary operator $A_{\mathcal{E}}$ can be written as

$$A_{\mathcal{E}} = A_{ii} + A_{io} + A_{oi} + A_{oo}, \quad (2)$$

where $A_{jk} = P_j A_{\mathcal{E}} P_k$, with $j, k = i, o$. If the decomposition (2) is used in operator expressions of the form $\chi_{\mathcal{E}} = A_{\mathcal{E}} \rho_{\mathcal{E}} A_{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger$, the corresponding ‘i-o’ operators are related by the matrix equation

$$\begin{pmatrix} \chi_{ii} & \chi_{io} \\ \chi_{oi} & \chi_{oo} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{ii} & A_{io} \\ A_{oi} & A_{oo} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{ii} & \rho_{io} \\ \rho_{oi} & \rho_{oo} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_{ii}^\dagger & A_{oi}^\dagger \\ A_{io}^\dagger & A_{oo}^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

where $A_{jk}^\dagger = P_k A_{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger P_j$.

III. THE UNITARY ATTACK

Let us assume that Eve performs a unitary quantum operation $F_{\mathcal{E}}$ on the encoded tagged message in transit between Alice and Bob. This operation changes the state of the encoded message from $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(k)$ to $F_{\mathcal{E}} \rho_{\mathcal{E}}(k) F_{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger$. Bob, ignorant about this malicious action, will perform his decoding operation on the encoded tagged message received, obtaining as the decoded tagged message the state

$$\rho_{\mathcal{E}}^E(k) = U^\dagger(k) F_{\mathcal{E}} \rho_{\mathcal{E}}(k) F_{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger U(k) = Q(k) \rho_{\mathcal{E}} Q^\dagger(k), \quad (4)$$

where $Q(k) = U^\dagger(k) F_{\mathcal{E}} U(k)$. Thus, Eve will be successful in her attack if, when the k key was used, $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}^E(k) \in \mathcal{C}$. This condition can also be written in terms of the action of the P_i operator as

$$P_i \rho_{\mathcal{E}}^E(k) P_i = \rho_{\mathcal{E}}^E(k). \quad (5)$$

Since Eve does not know either which key Alice and Bob used or the actual message sent, $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$, the probability of her action being unnoticed is one if and only if

$$\rho_{\mathcal{E}}^E(k) \in \mathcal{C}, \quad \forall k, \quad \forall \rho_{\mathcal{E}} \in \mathcal{C}. \quad (6)$$

Using Eq. (4) in Eq. (5), one can rewrite (6) as

$$Q_{oi}(k) = 0, \quad \forall k. \quad (7)$$

Given the unitarity of the $Q(k)$ operators, Eq. (7) implies that $Q_{io}(k) = 0$, $\forall k$. In particular, for $k = 0$, we have that $Q_{oi}(0) = Q_{io}(0) = 0$, which, since $U(0) = I$, requires that $F_{oi} = F_{io} = 0$. All these restrictions on $F_{\mathcal{E}}$ can be summarized in the following commutators:

$$[F_{\mathcal{E}}, P_i] = 0, \quad (8)$$

$$[F_{\mathcal{E}}, P_i(k)] = 0, \quad \forall k \neq 0, \quad (9)$$

where the $P_i(k) = U(k)P_iU^\dagger(k)$ are the projectors resulting from the transformation of the P_i by the unitary operations $U(k)$. The commutator (8) requires Eve to use a block-diagonal unitary operator in her attack. The block structure of $F_{\mathcal{E}}$ depends on how Alice and Bob decided to split $\mathcal{E}$ into $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}^\perp$. This information is public, so we shall assume that Eve can always fulfill (8). But, can she always fulfill the $K - 1$ commutators in (9)? The $P_i(k)$ in these commutators can be written, making use of the ‘i-o’ decomposition, as

$$\begin{pmatrix} U_{ii}(k)U_{ii}^\dagger(k) & U_{ii}(k)U_{oi}^\dagger(k) \\ U_{oi}(k)U_{ii}^\dagger(k) & U_{oi}(k)U_{oi}^\dagger(k) \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} G_{ii}(k) & H(k) \\ H^\dagger(k) & G_{oi}(k) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

Assuming the block-diagonal form for $F_{\mathcal{E}}$, and using the notation introduced in (10), the commutators in (9) can be expressed in block form as:

$$[F_{ii}, G_{ii}(k)] = 0, \quad (11)$$

$$[F_{oo}, G_{oi}(k)] = 0, \quad (12)$$

$$F_{ii}H(k) = H(k)F_{oo}, \quad (13)$$

$$F_{oo}H^\dagger(k) = H^\dagger(k)F_{ii}, \quad (14)$$

$\forall k \neq 0$. Therefore, Eve would be always successful in her attack if she could find two unitary operators F_{ii} and F_{oo} obeying (11)–(14).

A. A simpler case: $K = 2$

The problem posed by Eqs. (11)–(14) is quite complex. In order to gain some insight into its possible solution, we shall begin studying the simpler case $K = 2$ (Alice and Bob share a key of just one bit). In this case, Eqs. (11)–(14) reduce to

$$[F_{ii}, G_{ii}] = 0, \quad (15)$$

$$[F_{oo}, G_{oi}] = 0, \quad (16)$$

$$F_{ii}H = HF_{oo}, \quad (17)$$

$$F_{oo}H^\dagger = H^\dagger F_{ii}. \quad (18)$$

Since G_{ii} and G_{oi} are Hermitian operators, and because one can always find an operator that commutes with an Hermitian operator [9], we could begin solving the equations above selecting the F_{ii} that fulfills (15) or, alternatively, selecting the F_{oo} that fulfills (16). Then we could obtain F_{oo} (or F_{ii}) from (17). This last step, however, requires a previous discussion about the nonsingular character of H . First, note that H need not be square (it would be square if $\dim(\mathcal{C})=\dim(\mathcal{C}^\perp)$; i.e. if $C = D$); also note that we do not know the rank of H . To “invert” H in these circumstances we have to apply the Singular-Value Decomposition Theorem for general matrices [9]. Let us consider separately the cases of maximum and non maximum rank.

1. The rank of H is maximum

If $C = D$, then $\text{rank}(H) = C$, $\det(H) \neq 0$, and therefore H is nonsingular. If $C \neq D$, we can use the Singular-Value Decomposition of H to show that:

1. If $C < D$, there exists an operator J such that $HJ = I_{C \times C}$.
2. If $C > D$, there exists an operator J such that $JH = I_{D \times D}$.

In both cases it can be shown that Eqs. (15)–(18) have a non-trivial solution for F_{ii} and F_{oo} . For example, if $C < D$ we could select a non-trivial F_{oo} obeying (16), then F_{ii} would be uniquely obtained from (17), and it is not difficult to show that they would also obey (15) and (18).

2. The rank of H is not maximum

Suppose $\text{rank}(H) = N < C \leq D$. The Singular-Value Decomposition leads in this case to $H = V\Sigma W^\dagger$, where V and W are unitary matrices, and Σ is the diagonal matrix containing in its diagonal the singular values of H . Note that, since $\text{rank}(H) < C$, part of the singular values will be zero. Therefore, it is straightforward to see that one can find in this case a matrix J such that

$$HJ = V \left(\begin{array}{c|c} I_{N \times N} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) V^\dagger. \quad (19)$$

This would be the “invertibility” condition for H in this case. Although the algebra is a little bit more complicated now, also in this case one can show that Eqs. (15)–(18) have a non-trivial solution for F_{ii} and F_{oo} . The same conclusion can be reached if $\text{rank}(H) = N$ and $C > D$. Note, however, that now the family of solutions is bigger than in the former case, because, given F_{oo} , there is more than one F_{ii} fulfilling (17).

In summary, we have shown that when $K = 2$ (Alice’s and Bob’s keys are one-bit long), Eve can always successfully manipulate Alice’s message and pass Bob’s verification test. Therefore, one-bit keys, independently of the length of the tag appended to the message and of the length of the message itself, cause the failure of the protocol. This result generalizes our conclusion in [6] to arbitrary message and tag spaces.

B. $K > 2$

In the preceding Subsection we have seen that Eve can select a unitary quantum operation, $F_{\mathcal{E}}$, such that conditions (11)–(14) are satisfied for $k \leq 1$. Let us see whether she can select a $F_{\mathcal{E}}$ obeying also (11)–(14) $\forall k > 1$. Consider the first of the conditions, Eq. (11). This equation, for the case of the preceding Subsection ($k \leq 1$), is $[F_{ii}, G_{ii}(1)] = 0$. Since $G_{ii}(1)$ is Hermitian, it can be written in diagonal form:

$$G_{ii}(1) = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_{ii}^1(1) & & \mathbf{0} \\ & \ddots & \\ \mathbf{0} & & \lambda_{ii}^C(1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (20)$$

where the $\lambda_{ii}^r(1)$ ($r = 1, \dots, C$) are the eigenvalues of $G_{ii}(1)$. If we denote the p, q element of F_{ii} as $a_{ii}(p, q)$, the condition $[F_{ii}, G_{ii}(1)] = 0$ requires that

$$\lambda_{ii}^p(1) = \lambda_{ii}^q(1), \quad \forall p \neq q; p, q = 1, \dots, C, \quad (21)$$

or

$$a_{ii}(p, q) = 0, \quad \forall p \neq q; p, q = 1, \dots, C. \quad (22)$$

Eq. (21) is a requirement on Alice and Bob, so they, in order to protect themselves from Eve’s attack, can by design avoid it, just selecting $G_{ii}(1)$ with all its eigenvalues different. This can be done only in the case that $C \leq D$, because if $C > D$ the unitarity of $U(1)$ shows that at least $C - D$ eigenvalues have to be equal to one. Thus, from now on we will impose $C \leq D$ and consider separately the cases $C = D$ and $C < D$. In both cases, however, Eve will have to choose $F_{\mathcal{E}}$ obeying (22), i.e. $F_{\mathcal{E}}$ must be diagonal in the same base in which $G_{ii}(1)$ is diagonal:

$$F_{ii} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{ii}^1 & & \mathbf{0} \\ & \ddots & \\ \mathbf{0} & & a_{ii}^C \end{pmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

where $|a_{ii}^r| = 1$ ($r = 1, \dots, C$).

1. The case $C = D$

Let us see if the diagonal form of F_{ii} is compatible with, for instance, the condition $[F_{ii}, G_{ii}(2)] = 0$. If we denote by $g_{ii}^{(2)}(p, q)$ the p, q element of $G_{ii}(2)$, this commutator is zero when

$$a_{ii}^p = a_{ii}^q, \quad \forall p \neq q, \quad (24)$$

or

$$g_{ii}^{(2)}(p, q) = 0, \quad \forall p \neq q. \quad (25)$$

Again, Eq. (25) is a requirement on Alice and Bob, and they can, by design, avoid it. This means that Eve, in order to be successful in her attack, would have to fulfill (24). But this condition implies that $F_{ii} = \exp(i\alpha)I_{C \times C}$, with α any angle. Since $C = D$ and $\text{rank}[H(1)]$ is maximum (which depends only on Alice and Bob), F_{oo} is uniquely determined by (17) and must also have the form $F_{oo} = \exp(i\alpha)I_{C \times C}$. In conclusion, $F_{\mathcal{E}}$ would be a module-one multiple of the identity operation, but this is the trivial solution (Eve does not modify the state in the channel).

In summary, we have shown that if Alice and Bob select the splitting of $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{C} \oplus \mathcal{C}^\perp$, $U(1)$ and $U(2)$ such that

1. $\dim(\mathcal{C}) = \dim(\mathcal{C}^\perp)$
2. $\text{rank}[H(1)]$ and $\text{rank}[H(2)]$ are maximum,
3. $G_{ii}(1)$ and $G_{ii}(2)$ have all their eigenvalues different,
4. and $G_{ii}(1)$ and $G_{ii}(2)$ do not share any eigenvector,

then Eve cannot, performing a unitary operation on the state in the channel, produce the failure of the protocol in a deterministic way. Thus two bits of key are sufficient to make the probability of Eve being unnoticed less than one.

The four conditions above can be analysed from a geometric perspective. The first one says that half of the tag space is considered valid by Alice and Bob, which in fact is equivalent to having just one qubit of tag. In the second condition $H(1) = U_{ii}(1)U_{oi}^\dagger(1)$, so its rank is maximum and equal to C only if the rank of $U_{ii}(1)$ and $U_{oi}(1)$ are also C . This means that $\mathcal{C}_1$, the subspace of valid messages transformed by $U(1)$, is such that no state in $\mathcal{C}_1$ has null projection over $\mathcal{C}$ nor $\mathcal{C}^\perp$. In other words, $\mathcal{C}_1$ is maximally spread over the original valid and invalid message subspaces, and the same holds for $U(2)$. In the third condition, $G_{ii}(1) = U_{ii}(1)U_{ii}^\dagger(1)$, thus the basis where $G_{ii}(1)$ is diagonal represents a basis of $\mathcal{C}$ with the following property: its image under $U^\dagger(1)$, projected over $\mathcal{C}$, is a C -dimensional set of orthogonal vectors, and the norm of each projected vector is given by the corresponding eigenvalue of $G_{ii}(1)$. If the eigenvalues are all different then this basis is unique up to some arbitrary global factors. Finally, the fourth condition says that the above bases for $G_{ii}(1)$ and $G_{ii}(2)$ are maximally spread one over the other.

2. The case $C < D$

If $C < D$ F_{oo} is not uniquely determined by (17) and the situation is more complex. From now on we shall assume that D is a multiple integer of C , so $D = qC$, $q > 1$. This is in fact the natural situation when using qubits, since both D and C are powers of two. Following the argument of the preceding section, in the bases of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ where $G_{ii}(1)$ and $G_{oi}(1)$ are respectively diagonal, from (13), with $k = 1$, we get:

$$F_{oo} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \exp(i\alpha)I_C & 0 \\ \hline 0 & W_1 \end{array} \right), \quad (26)$$

with W_1 an arbitrary unitary operator in a $(q-1)C$ dimensional space. But we may obtain further restrictions on W_1 from (12)–(14). First, note that $[F_{oo}, G_{oi}(1)] = 0$ for all W_1 . The reason is that, although $G_{oi}(1)$ is diagonal, W_1 does not have to since $G_{oi}(1)$ has at least $(q-1)C$ zero eigenvalues (recall that it is a qC -dimensional hermitian operator and its maximum rank is C). Let us write the matrix representation of $G_{oi}(1)$ as

$$G_{oi} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \Lambda_{oi}(1) & 0 \\ \hline 0 & O_{(q-1)C} \end{array} \right), \quad (27)$$

where $\Lambda_{oi}(1)$ is the diagonal C -dimensional matrix containing the non-zero eigenvalues of $G_{oi}(1)$, and $O_{(q-1)C}$ is the zero, $(q-1)C$ -dimensional matrix. Now Alice and Bob, in order to choose a $U(2)$ such that $G_{oi}(1)$ and $G_{oi}(2)$ do not share any eigenvector, would like to restrict W_1 as much as possible. But, since both operators have $(q-1)C$ zero eigenvalues (i.e. $\dim(\ker[G_{oi}(1)]) = \dim(\ker[G_{oi}(2)]) = (q-1)C$), this cannot be done. The reason is that the total space where $G_{oi}(k)$ acts has dimension qC , so $\dim\{\ker[G_{oi}(1)] \cap \ker[G_{oi}(2)]\} \geq (q-2)C$. Thus, $G_{oi}(1)$ and $G_{oi}(2)$ share at least $(q-2)C$ eigenvectors.

For simplicity, although this might not be the optimal situation, let us further assume that Alice and Bob choose $U(2)$ such that $G_{oi}(1)$ and $G_{oi}(2)$ are diagonal in the same basis, but $G_{oi}(2)$ has its C non-zero eigenvalues shifted in the following way:

$$G_{oi}(2) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} O_C & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \Lambda_{oi}(2) & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & O_{(q-2)C} \end{array} \right). \quad (28)$$

If the eigenvalues of $G_{ii}(2)$ are all different, the unitarity of $U(2)$ makes the eigenvalues of $G_{oi}(2)$ to be also different (in fact, each pair sums up to 1). Then $[F_{oo}, G_{oi}(2)] = 0$ if and only if W_1 has the following block diagonal form:

$$W_1 = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \Omega_C & 0 \\ \hline 0 & W_2 \end{array} \right), \quad (29)$$

with Ω_C a unitary, diagonal, C -dimensional matrix, and W_2 any unitary $(q-2)C$ -dimensional operator. Using the result above, together with $F_{ii} = \exp(i\alpha)I_C$, in (13) or (14) with $k=2$, gives $\Omega_C = \exp(i\alpha)I_C$, so we have:

$$F_{oo} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} \exp(i\alpha)I_C & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \exp(i\alpha)I_C & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & W_2 \end{array} \right). \quad (30)$$

Following the same line of reasoning, it is not difficult to see that, in order to make $F_{oo} = \exp(i\alpha)I_{qC}$, Alice and Bob need $q+1$ unitary encoding operators, $U(0), \dots, U(q)$ such that:

1. $\text{rank}[H(k)]$ is maximum $\forall k > 0$;
2. $G_{ii}(k)$ has all its eigenvalues different $\forall k > 0$;
3. for at least two values of k , say $r, s \neq 0$, $G_{ii}(r)$ and $G_{ii}(s)$ do not share any eigenvector;
4. and $\forall k \neq k', k, k' \neq 0$, the range of $G_{oi}(k)$ and $G_{oi}(k')$ span disjoint, orthogonal, C -dimensional subspaces of $\mathcal{C}^\perp$.

In the particular case in which we have messages of m qubits, a tag of t qubits, and just a one-dimensional valid tag subspace, $C = 2^m$ and $D = (2^t - 1)C$, so $q+1 = 2^t$, and the number of bits of the classical key equals the number of tag qubits.

IV. THE FORGERY ATTACK

Assume now that Eve has the power to replace the tagged message in transit between Alice and Bob with a forged tagged message of her own, ρ_E . From this tagged message, Bob will decode the state

$$\rho_{\mathcal{E}}^E(k) = U^\dagger(k)\rho_E U(k), \quad (31)$$

if the value of the key shared with Alice is k . The probability of Eve being undetected is one when Eq. (6) is satisfied, where $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(k) = U^\dagger(k)\rho_E U(k)$. This condition can be restated as

$$P_i U^\dagger(k)\rho_E U(k)P_i = U^\dagger(k)\rho_E U(k), \quad \forall k. \quad (32)$$

If we rewrite this equation in terms of the ‘i-o’ decompositions of its operators, one finds that the $k = 0$ case requires ρ_E to be necessarily of the form

$$\rho_E = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{ii} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (33)$$

and that, in the rest of the cases ($\forall k \neq 0$), $U_{io}^\dagger(k)\rho_{ii} = 0$, or, equivalently,

$$\rho_{ii} \in \bigcap_{k \neq 0} \ker[U_{io}^\dagger(k)]. \quad (34)$$

In order to make Eve’s attack unsuccessful, Alice and Bob should choose the $U_{io}^\dagger(k)$ such that $\bigcap_{k \neq 0} \ker[U_{io}^\dagger(k)] = \{\emptyset\}$. One possibility is that $\ker[U_{io}^\dagger(k)] = \{\emptyset\}$, $\forall k \neq 0$. This can be accomplished if the dimensions of the spaces $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}^\perp$, C and D , respectively, are such that $C \leq D$, since, in this case, Alice and Bob can always make the rank of $U_{io}^\dagger(k)$ equal to C , $\forall k \neq 0$. Geometrically, this condition says that no state in $\mathcal{C}$ has null projection over $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ after it has been transformed by $U^\dagger(k)$. In other words, the subspace $\mathcal{C}_k$ is different from $\mathcal{C}$, $\forall k > 0$.

V. DISCUSSION

In the preceding sections we have shown the feasibility of quantum authentication schemes based on unitary coding sets. We have given the conditions that a particular family of unitary operations $\{U(k)\}$, $k = 0, \dots, K-1$, has to fulfill in order to make, under unitary and forgery attacks, Eve’s probability of success less than one. In the case of the unitary attack we have shown that $\log(q+1)$ bits of classical key are enough when the ratio between the dimensions of the invalid and valid tag subspaces is q , independently of the number qubits of the original message. This result may seem surprising, but not too practical since one would expect the effectiveness of such a protocol to be very low. In fact, to quantitatively study the security of an authentication protocol based on this scheme, one should find an appropriate family $\{U(k)\}$ and obtain lower bounds for P_e^f and P_e^u , the error probabilities under forgery and unitary attacks, respectively.

In the case of the forgery attack,

$$P_e^f = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} [P_i U(k)^\dagger \rho_E U(k)] = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} [P_i(k) \rho_E], \quad (35)$$

with $P_i(k) = U(k)P_i U^\dagger(k)$ the projector over $\mathcal{C}_k$, and ρ_E any state in $\mathcal{E}$ selected by Eve. The above probability is bounded by the maximum eigenvalue of the hermitian operator $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} P_i(k)$, so Alice and Bob’s goal is to minimize the maximum eigenvalue of this operator. For simplicity, assume the dimension of the total Hilbert space $\mathcal{E}$ is an integer multiple of the dimension of the code subspace $\mathcal{C}$, $E = pC$, $p > 1$. If Alice and Bob choose a family $\{U(k)\}$ with $K \leq p$, such that the projectors $\{P_i(k)\}$ are mutually orthogonal, then the maximum eigenvalue of $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} P_i(k)$ is minimized to one, and $P_e^f \leq 1/K$.

But unfortunately this family of encoding operators is clearly insecure against the unitary attack. The complete expression for P_e^u , the probability of Eve being unnoticed when Alice prepared $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$ under the unitary attack is:

$$P_e^u = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} [P_i U^\dagger(k) F_{\mathcal{E}} \rho_{\mathcal{E}}(k) F_{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger U(k)] = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} [P_i(k) F_{\mathcal{E}} \rho_{\mathcal{E}}(k) F_{\mathcal{E}}^\dagger], \quad (36)$$

with $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(k) = U(k)\rho_{\mathcal{E}}U^\dagger(k)$. Because the subspaces $\mathcal{C}_k$ obtained after transforming $\mathcal{C}$ with the $U(k)$ above are all orthogonal, disjoint subspaces of $\mathcal{E}$, if Eve chooses a unitary operator $F_{\mathcal{E}}$ acting inside each subspace separately with the general form:

$$F_{\mathcal{E}} = \sum_{l=0}^{K-1} P_i(l) F_{\mathcal{E}} P_i(l), \quad (37)$$

then its action on $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(k)$ gives $F_{\mathcal{E}}\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(k)F_{\mathcal{E}}^{\dagger} = P_i(k)F_{\mathcal{E}}\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(k)F_{\mathcal{E}}^{\dagger}P_i(k)$, which is invariant under projection over $P_i(k)$. Therefore,

$$P_e^u = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} [F_{\mathcal{E}}\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(k)F_{\mathcal{E}}^{\dagger}] = 1. \quad (38)$$

Finding a family $\{U(k)\}$ producing an acceptable bound for P_e^u is not easy. One possible family, using the formalism of quantum stabilizer error correcting codes, has been given by Barnum [2] with $P_e \sim (2 + 2m/t)/(2^t + 1)$ for a key of length $2m + O(t)$ bits. Intuitively, the nature of the conditions on the $\{U(k)\}$ given in the preceding Section seems to indicate that P_e^u would decrease with the overlapping between the subspaces $\mathcal{C}_k$; however, that overlapping cannot be too big, because if, in the limiting case, the subspaces $\mathcal{C}_k$ are actually the same subspace, then the probability of failure under both types of attacks would be one. Specifically, in the forgery case, $U(k)P_iU^{\dagger}(k) = P_i \forall k$, and therefore $P_e^f = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} (P_i\rho_E) = 1$ for any $\rho_E \in \mathcal{C}$. In the case of the unitary attack, if Eve chooses $F_{\mathcal{E}}$ such that $[F_{\mathcal{E}}, P_i] = 0$ then,

$$P_e^u = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} [P_i F_{\mathcal{E}}\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(k)F_{\mathcal{E}}^{\dagger}] = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \text{tr}_{\mathcal{E}} [P_i\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(k)] = 1, \quad (39)$$

where the last equality is obtained using the fact that if $\rho_E(k) \in \mathcal{C}$, then $P_i\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(k) = \rho_{\mathcal{E}}(k)$, $\forall k$. Thus we would be looking for an intermediate situation, in which the $\mathcal{C}_k$ are not orthogonal neither coincident C -dimensional subspaces inside $\mathcal{E}$. But what family of $\{U(k)\}$ is optimal remains an open problem. It might even be the case that no optimal strategy to handle at the same time the two types of attack can be found: Loosely speaking, if we represent P_e^u and P_e^f against some type of measure of the overlapping between the subspaces $\mathcal{C}_k$, then one would expect P_e^f to increase from its minimus value to one as the overlapping increases, and P_e^u to have at least one minimus in an intermediate point between zero and total overlapping. But the two curves might not cross, or cross in different ways, making the decision on which is the optimal family of encoding operators not obvious.

VI. CONCLUSION

We have addressed the problem of how to authenticate quantum messages between two partners (Alice and Bob) connected by an ideal quantum communication channel. Any authentication process requires a previous secret between the communicating partners, and we have assumed that Alice and Bob share a classical secret key. Our authentication scheme uses a tagging procedure in the transmitting end, and unitary operations selected by the key (encoding and decoding rules), on both ends of the channel. In our feasibility analysis, failure can be caused by an undesired unitary manipulation of the information in transit between the partners, or by impersonation (forgery of a fake authentication message). We have shown the conditions that the sets of encoding and decoding rules must satisfy to make authentication possible. These conditions are better stated in terms of geometrical relations between the subspaces of valid tagged messages selected by each unitary rule. Specifically, to protect against forgery, we have shown that no pair of subspaces has to be coincident; in fact, the failure probability reaches its minimum, which is inverse in the key length, when the spaces are all disjoint and orthogonal. On the other hand, to protect against the unitary attack, the restrictions on the encoding rules are much more involved. Briefly, an intermediate situation, one in which the encoding subspaces are neither coincident nor disjoint, seems to be the desired setting. In particular, a key length of order D/C , the ratio between the dimension of the invalid and valid message subspaces, is enough.

Many open questions related to the quantum authentication schemes analysed deserve further investigation. First, one would like to find the optimal family of encoding rules protecting against the unitary or even more general (those based on TPCP maps) attacks, and to give an explicit expression for the probability of failure in terms of the encoding rules employed. This may require a more practical definition of the probability of failure. For instance, Eve might, with high probability, transform the original message, but only in a way such that the fidelity between the original and the transformed state be still very high. It could also be the case that she could strongly transform, without being noticed, messages inside a particular subspace of the valid message space, and be noticed if she transforms messages outside it. All these situations would have to be considered by Alice and Bob in any practical implementation of the protocol. Another important practical issue is whether an optimal family of encoding rules against both types of attacks exists.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by Xunta de Galicia (Spain, grant No. PGIDT00PXI322060PR) and the Spanish Government (grant No. TIC2001-3217).

-
- [1] Ambainis, A., Mosca, M., Tapp, A., & de Wolf, R. 2000. Private quantum channels. *Pages 547–553 of: Proc. 41st annual symposium on foundations of computer science*. Los Alamitos, CA.: IEEE Computer Society Press.
 - [2] Barnum, H., Crépeau, C., Gottesman, D., Smith, A., & Tapp, A. *Authentication of quantum messages*. quant-ph/0205128.
 - [3] Bennett, C. H., Brassard, G., Crépeau, C., Jozsa, R., Peres, A., & Wootters, W.K. 1993. Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels. *Physical Review Letters*, **70**(march), 1895–1899.
 - [4] Boykin, P. O., & Roychowdhury, V. *Optimal encryption of quantum bits*. quant-ph/0003059.
 - [5] Curty, M., & Santos, D. J. 2001. Quantum authentication of classical messages. *Physical Review A*, **64**, 062309.
 - [6] Curty, M., Santos, D. J., Pérez, E., & García-Fernández, P. 2002. Qubit authentication. *Physical Review A*, **66**, 022301.
 - [7] Gea-Banacloche, J. 2002. Hiding messages in quantum data. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, **43**(9), 4531–4536.
 - [8] Gilbert, E. N., MacWilliams, F. J., & Sloane, N. J. A. 1974. Codes which detect deception. *Bell System Technical Journal*, **53**, 405–424.
 - [9] Horn, R. A., & Johnson, C. R. 1985. *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 - [10] Leung, D. W. 2002. Quantum Vernam cipher. *Quantum Information & Computation*, **2**(1), 14–34.
 - [11] Menezes, A. J., Oorschot, P. C. Van, & Vanstone, S. A. 1996. *Handbook of applied cryptography*. Series on Discrete Mathematics and Its Applications. CRC Press.
 - [12] Simmons, G. J. 1992. A survey of information authentication. *Pages 379–419 of: Simmons, G. J. (ed), Contemporary cryptology, the science of information integrity*. IEEE Press. [A preliminary version appeared in *Proceedings of the IEEE* **76** (1988), 603–620].
 - [13] Vernam, G. S. 1926. Cipher printing telegraph systems for secret wire and radio telegraphic communications. *Journal of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers*, **45**, 109–115.
 - [14] Wegman, M. N., & Carter, J. L. 1981. New hash functions and their use in authentication and set equality. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, **22**, 265–279.